

Attorney Docket No.: 06137.0021.US02 (RU-0075)
Inventors: Anderson et al.
Serial No.: 09/181,601
Filing Date: October 29, 1998
Page 2

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-17 have been rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wallace et al. (Protein Science (June 1996) 5:1001-1013). Arguments presented in the previous response submitted by Applicants on October 24, 2000 were not found persuasive as the Examiner suggests that the different feature by which Applicants distinguish their invention, namely the size of the protein domain, is not distinct from the teaching of Wallace which shows a three dimensional putative polypeptide domain which is composed of at least 195 amino acids. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusions.

The paper by Wallace et al. (1996) teaches derivation of 3-dimensional coordinate templates that have been derived from known 3-dimensional protein structures that are provided in a database and then determination of biochemical function based on the existence of known 3-dimensional structures. This method is based

Attorney Docket No.: 06137.0021.US02 (RU-0075)
Inventors: Anderson et al.
Serial No.: 09/181,601
Filing Date: October 29, 1998
Page 3

on identification of a triad (i.e., three, amino acids, Ser-His-Asp) that occur in a 3-dimensional configuration to form an active site. Nowhere does this paper teach or suggest a protein domain larger than three amino acids. A declaration is provided herewith by Dr. Montelione, a co-inventor in the instant application affirming the validity of this interpretation of the teachings of Wallace et al. (1996). In this declaration, the numbering of the amino acids and a determination of how many amino acids have been identified is clarified and the teachings of the Wallace reference clearly distinguished.

In the present invention, the protein domain referred to in the claims is limited to one from 50 to 300 amino acid, a size much larger than that taught by Wallace et al. (1996). Accordingly, the reference of Wallace et al. fails to teach the limitations of the invention as claimed and cannot anticipate the instant invention (MPEP 2131). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5-9, 11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. in view of Friedrichs et al. (J. Biomol. NMR (1994) 4:703-726). Claims 1-9,

Attorney Docket No.: 06137.0021.US02 (RU-0075)
Inventors: Anderson et al.
Serial No.: 09/181,601
Filing Date: October 29, 1998
Page 4

11, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. in view of Friedrichs et al. and further in view of Farber et al. (J. Mol. Biol. (1992) 226:471-479). In addition, claims 1, 5-11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. in view of Friedrichs et al. and further in view of Bagby et al. (J. Biomol. NMR (1997) 10:279-282). Finally, claims 1-9 and 11-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. in view of Friedrichs et al. and further in view of Farber et al. (J. Mol. Biol. (1992) 226:471-479) and further in view of Orengo et al. (Structure (August 1997) 5:1093-1108). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusions regarding each rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and therefore traverse these rejections.

MPEP § 2143 states that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Attorney Docket No.

Inventors:

Serial No.:

Filing Date:

Page 5



06137.0021.US02 (RU-0075)

Anderson et al.

09/181,601

October 29, 1998

As discussed in Section I, *supra*, the primary reference by Wallace et al. does not teach the identification of protein domains of 50 to 300 amino acids. Nor is there any suggestion of this step as Wallace et al. teaches use of a triad of amino acids. Accordingly, the primary reference fails to teach or suggest all the limitations as now claimed. This reference is common to each of the rejections cited.

The secondary references cited under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) fail to overcome the deficiencies in teaching of this primary reference.

The teachings of Friedrichs et al. are related to an automated system for protein ^{15}N , ^{13}C , and ^1H NMR resonance assignments from a set of three-dimensional NMR spectra. This reference provides no teaching or suggestion of identifying a putative polypeptide domain that properly folds into a stable polypeptide domain of 50 to 300 amino acids as claimed.

Farber et al. disclose a neural network and information theory for determination of coding regions of DNA sequences. This reference also contains no teaching or suggestion with respect to identification of protein or polypeptide domains of 50 to 300 amino acids.

Similarly references by Bagby et al. and Orengo et al. fail to teach or suggest this claim limitation. As acknowledged by the

Attorney Docket No.: 06137.0021.US02 (RU-0075)
Inventors: Anderson et al.
Serial No.: 09/181,601
Filing Date: October 29, 1998
Page 6

Examiner, the teachings of Bagby et al. are related to preparation of samples for NMR analysis while the teachings of Orengo et al. are limited to the use of the CATH method for classification of protein domains.

Both the MPEP and the case law are clear; to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) and MPEP § 2143.03. Accordingly, since none of the prior art references teach or suggest the limitation of identifying a putative polypeptide domain that properly folds into a stable polypeptide domain of 50 to 300 amino acids, the cited combinations of prior art cannot render obvious the invention as set forth in claim 1 or claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the foregoing comprises a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly,

Attorney Docket No.: 06137.0021.US02 (RU-0075)
Inventors: Anderson et al.
Serial No.: 09/181,601
Filing Date: October 29, 1998
Page 7

favorable reconsideration and subsequent allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Massey Licata

Jane Massey Licata
Registration No. 32,257

Date: June 13, 2001

LICATA & TYRRELL P.C.
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, New Jersey 08053

(856) 810-1515